



## CTMS Compatibility Grading SIG Teleconference Meeting Minutes

<b>Meeting Date</b>	August 20, 2004 12-1 PM EDT																					
<b>Attendees:</b>	<p><b>Working group coordinator:</b> Scott Finley (Booz Allen Hamilton) Harshawardhan Bal (Booz Allen Hamilton) Arumani Manisundaram (Booz Allen Hamilton)</p> <p><b>NCI facilitator:</b> Sue Dubman</p> <p><b>Participants:</b></p> <table><tr><th>Name</th><th>Email</th><th>Organization</th></tr><tr><td><b>Teri Melese (SIG Lead)</b></td><td><b>tmelese@cc.ucsf.edu</b></td><td><b>UCSF</b></td></tr><tr><td><b>John Speakman (SIG Lead)</b></td><td><b>speakman@biost.mskcc.org</b></td><td><b>Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center</b></td></tr><tr><td>Derek Walker</td><td><a href="mailto:dwalker@fhcrc.org">dwalker@fhcrc.org</a></td><td>Fred Hutch/UW</td></tr><tr><td>Warren Kibbe</td><td><a href="mailto:wakibbe@northwestern.edu">wakibbe@northwestern.edu</a></td><td>Northwestern Univ.</td></tr><tr><td>Lara Fournier</td><td><a href="mailto:fourniel@ohsu.edu">fourniel@ohsu.edu</a></td><td>OHSU</td></tr><tr><td>Karen Kimura</td><td><a href="mailto:KKimura@cc.ucsf.edu">KKimura@cc.ucsf.edu</a></td><td>UCSF</td></tr></table>	Name	Email	Organization	<b>Teri Melese (SIG Lead)</b>	<b>tmelese@cc.ucsf.edu</b>	<b>UCSF</b>	<b>John Speakman (SIG Lead)</b>	<b>speakman@biost.mskcc.org</b>	<b>Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center</b>	Derek Walker	<a href="mailto:dwalker@fhcrc.org">dwalker@fhcrc.org</a>	Fred Hutch/UW	Warren Kibbe	<a href="mailto:wakibbe@northwestern.edu">wakibbe@northwestern.edu</a>	Northwestern Univ.	Lara Fournier	<a href="mailto:fourniel@ohsu.edu">fourniel@ohsu.edu</a>	OHSU	Karen Kimura	<a href="mailto:KKimura@cc.ucsf.edu">KKimura@cc.ucsf.edu</a>	UCSF
Name	Email	Organization																				
<b>Teri Melese (SIG Lead)</b>	<b>tmelese@cc.ucsf.edu</b>	<b>UCSF</b>																				
<b>John Speakman (SIG Lead)</b>	<b>speakman@biost.mskcc.org</b>	<b>Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center</b>																				
Derek Walker	<a href="mailto:dwalker@fhcrc.org">dwalker@fhcrc.org</a>	Fred Hutch/UW																				
Warren Kibbe	<a href="mailto:wakibbe@northwestern.edu">wakibbe@northwestern.edu</a>	Northwestern Univ.																				
Lara Fournier	<a href="mailto:fourniel@ohsu.edu">fourniel@ohsu.edu</a>	OHSU																				
Karen Kimura	<a href="mailto:KKimura@cc.ucsf.edu">KKimura@cc.ucsf.edu</a>	UCSF																				
<b>Agenda</b>	<p>1. Status Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Members of our SIG chosen to evaluate their CTMS<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>i. Teri Melese/Karen Kimura UCSF Cancer Center</li><li>ii. John Speakman Memorial Sloan Kettering</li><li>iii. Doug Frisdma Pittsburgh</li></ul></li><li>b. Phase I: Message from NCI to vendor community regarding involvement and compatibility</li><li>c. Phase II: Idea is that these people will carefully read the caBIG guidelines and make suggestions to architecture group for clarification<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>i. The guidelines should also make it clear enough for investigators at the various Cancer Centers to understand if their current system has the required architecture.</li></ul></li><li>d. Phase III: Details of any validation tests used by NCICB for C3D shared with this group as a possible starting point for development</li></ul>																					

	<p>of validation tests</p> <p>2. Once guidelines are complete and any information on tests done by NCICB are obtained, do we agree that this will be the outline for a first pass evaluation of existing CTMS?</p> <p>3. Questions for Discussion by our SIG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Do people see adherence to CaBIG guidelines as equal to or different from being caBIG Compatibility?</li> <li>b. If yes, how do we begin to identify the needed steps to generate a report card for caBIG compatibility? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. This work to be done by the workspace groups as part of their scope of work?</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>4. Is generated report card an indicator of alignment or compatibility?</p>
<p><b>General discussion points raised by participants:</b></p>	<p>1. Incorporate any changes to the caBIG compatibility guidelines since last version of June 17, 2004; obtain suggestions from various SIG members to update the document</p> <p>2. Clarify the goals of the caBIG compatibility guidelines in achieving interoperability at two levels: physical (syntactic) interoperability where different systems can freely exchange data and operational (semantic or functional) interoperability, where data can be integrated from diverse sources to generate useful knowledge. Establish a clear understanding of the role of the Architecture workspace/Compatibility Grading SIG in developing specs or tests to facilitate interoperability at one or both levels. The group felt that achieving syntactic interoperability could be the first goal, which could subsequently, along with feedback from the user community, dictate how semantic interoperability could be achieved.</p> <p>3. Utilizing a well-developed system as a test case – for example, Adverse events reporting – which has a defined set of components/modules and defined outcomes, could be a way to begin defining a validation suite of tests. The experience gained from a pilot run using the test case would enable the group to develop guidelines for other systems.</p>
<p><b>Action items:</b></p>	<p>Circulate the caBIG Compatibility Guidelines to Teri Melese, John Speakman, Derek Walker, Warren Kibbe, Lara Fournier and Karen Kimura for suggestions and comments on updating the document. Feedback to be sent to Arumani Manisundaram, Scott Finley and Harshawardhan Bal for collation and distribution by 09/27/04.</p>